

Columba Palumbus, Linn. (Wood Pigeon Quice.) Common during the winter months, doing great mischief to the young clover by feeding on it, picking out the green leaves in the centre of each bunch.

Columba Œnas, Ray. (Stock Dove.) Common.

Turtur auritus, Ray. (Turtle Dove.) Breeds in Shropshire, where it is called the Wrekin dove.

XXXIII.—*A Reply to Mr. Ogilby's Communication to the Annals of Natural History respecting Phalangista Cookii.*
By J. E. GRAY, Esq., F.R.S., Senior Assistant in the Zoological Department of the British Museum.

My dear Sir,

IN replying to Mr. Ogilby's communication in your last Number I will not suffer myself to be betrayed into the use of acrimonious expressions, which are unsuited to scientific discussions, and serve only to irritate, and which I should regret the moment they were written. The only purport of this note is to explain, in as few words as possible, my impressions relative to the material facts adverted to in the communication to which I refer.

The scientific objects of that communication are two in number; first, Mr. Ogilby contends that my name of *Antelope Zebra* should yield to that of *A. Doria* previously published by him; and on this point, as your readers are already aware, we are agreed:—secondly, Mr. Ogilby maintains that the name of *Phalangista Cookii* should be applied to the animal discovered by Sir Joseph Banks in Cook's first voyage, instead of that figured and described by Captain Cook himself. On this we differ; but I know not why this difference of opinion should give rise to angry feelings, or lead to the imputation of unworthy motives.

As regards the first point, it is scarcely necessary to do more than refer to the note which you have already printed (p. 221). I may state, however, that when my description of the two more perfect specimens of the antelope in question, then in my possession, was printed in the Annals, I was quite unconscious that Mr. Ogilby had published anything on the subject. Mr. Bennett had described the original specimen as "obtained by Mr. Gould from Algoa Bay," and had indicated his opinion of its relations in the following terms: "The quality of the fur is rather rigid, and the hairs are adpressed,

resembling in these particulars the covering of the zebras. It may not improbably belong to some species of antelope with which Europeans are yet unacquainted." (Proc. Zool. Soc. 1832, p. 123.) Mr. Ogilby's reference to it (Proc. Zool. Soc. 1836, p. 121) is verbatim as follows: "The beautiful species mentioned by Mr. Bennett (Proc. Zool. Soc. 1833, p. 1), which is a real *antelope*, and which I hope shortly to have an opportunity of describing in detail under the name of *A. Doria*, as a friend who has connections with the west coast of Africa has kindly undertaken to procure me skins."—He refers it, without stating any reason, to a group of antelopes, all the distinctive characters of which, as given by himself in the same place, are derived from the head and horns, neither of which (in *A. Doria*) are yet known to zoologists. This brief and incidental notice I had entirely overlooked; but immediately on being made acquainted with it, so little did I desire to usurp the honours of a questionable name, that I wrote of my own accord to Mr. Ogilby, stating my "intention to correct the error in the next Number of the Annals." At the same time I wrote the note published in your last Number, which, however, not being immediately sent to you, was mislaid and forgotten. To the charge of having neglected to send you the promised correction I plead guilty in the fullest extent, and must patiently submit to the punishment due to my crime. I may plead, however, in mitigation, that I had already placed in Mr. Ogilby's own hands a full and voluntary confession of my default.

On the question of nomenclature (the only practical point involved in the second count of Mr. Ogilby's indictment), I am more than ever convinced, after a careful re-examination of the subject, of the justice of the conclusion to which I had originally come. My *Phalangista Banksii* was discovered at Endeavour River, within the tropic, on the east coast of New Holland, by Sir J. Banks, in Captain Cook's first voyage (see Hawkesworth, iii. 586); it is not however there described, but a specimen brought home by the expedition formed the basis of Pennant's description of his "New Holland Opossum" in his History of Quadrupeds, edit. 1781, p. 310, and I am not aware of any other published description that can with certainty be referred to this species. My *Ph. Cookii* was found at Adventure Bay in Van Diemen's Land, in Captain Cook's third voyage; it is there described and figured. That figure and description are universally referred to as the originals from which the name of *Ph. Cookii* was derived; and even if the specimen described by authors under that name belonged to a different species, I should still maintain that the name of *Ph. Cookii* ought to remain connected with the animal figured

and described by Captain Cook himself. But it is quite unnecessary for my argument to go this length; for although Mr. Ogilby states very decidedly that the specimens in the Paris Museum belong to the continental or New Holland species, (meaning, I presume, that which was originally found at Endeavour River,) I think there are strong grounds for doubting the correctness of this opinion, which I will now proceed to state.

1st. All the French writers, as far as I am aware, who have described the *Phalangista Cookii*, and who mention its locality, speak of it as peculiar to Van Diemen's Land.

2ndly. Their descriptions appear to me strictly applicable to the Van Diemen's Land species.

3rdly. The original specimens in the French Museum are stated by M. Desmarest to have been brought home by Peron and Lesueur, and by M. Temminck to have been derived from the voyage of Labillardière. I know not which of these gentlemen is right, but in either case it is much more probable that the specimens were from Van Diemen's Land than from Endeavour River, both expeditions having visited Adventure Bay, while Peron and Lesueur touched at no part of the east coast of New Holland, except Port Jackson, and Labillardière did not visit that coast at all. I may add, that the Van Diemen's Land species is by far the most abundant in our own collections*.

These reasons appear to me to be so conclusive, that I would even venture to hope that they may induce Mr. Ogilby to reconsider his opinion.

As regards the personal matter introduced into the question by Mr. Ogilby, I am loath to meddle with it; he has, however, rendered it necessary that I should state the facts in justice to myself, and I am determined that this shall be done without a word of harshness or recrimination. Long before Mr. Ogilby made his observations on the subject at the Zoological Society, I had satisfied myself that there existed two very distinct varieties or species of white-tailed phalanger, confounded by Shaw under the name of "White-tailed Opos-

* To obviate any misunderstanding, it may be observed that M. Temminck has erroneously referred to a specimen in the French Museum, brought home by M. Gaimard, as having been procured from the island of Rawak, one of the Moluccas; but this error has been corrected by M. Lesson (Dict. Class. d'Hist. Nat. 13.), who, after giving Van Diemen's Land as the habitat of the species, expressly states that the specimen in question was obtained alive at Port Jackson. With the same view, I may add, that the animal described and figured as the *Ph. Cookii* in M. Frederic Cuvier's "Mammifères," and again described by the same author in the Dict. des Sciences Naturelles, under the name of *Petaurus Cookii*, belongs to a very different species from either of those in question.

sum." Mr. Ogilby's observations in no degree altered the view which I had already taken, but satisfied me, that as our courses were diametrically opposite, we could not possibly interfere with each other; and I did not hesitate, when adding my notes to Mr. Gunn's communication, to publish my long-formed opinion on the subject of one of the species therein mentioned. I did not refer to Mr. Ogilby's observations, because (as they were then unpublished) I might have unconsciously misrepresented them, and I could have referred to them for no other purpose than that of controverting his views, a task which on all occasions I would if possible avoid. Neither did I refer to the specimens, of which there are three, in the collection of the British Museum, and that for the same reason as is stated for the same forbearance on the part of Mr. Ogilby himself, "because I was unacquainted with their precise habitat," the localities obtained from dealers being in most cases difficult of verification. That they are of the same species with that figured in Cook's Voyage, I never entertained a doubt, and the specific name of *Cookii* was consequently long since attached to one of them, which has been for several years in the collection: the only recent alteration has been to substitute in place of the paper label another painted one bearing my new generic name.

With respect to the "supposition" that this was done in consequence of a visit to the Museum of the Zoological Society, and a refreshment of my memory from the abstract of Mr. Ogilby's observations in the minute book of the Society, I have only to state, that I have not visited the Museum for some months, except on the Anniversary Meeting of the Society held therein on the 30th of April, the day on which Mr. Ogilby's communication was published in your last Number; that I have never inspected the minute book for this or any similar purpose; and further, that I have never seen Mr. Ogilby's name attached to the skins of either of the species of *Phalangista* in question, or to the mutilated portions of the skin of *A. Doria* in the Society's collection. If I have reproduced Mr. Ogilby's observations "almost word for word," one or other of us must have been singularly unfortunate in the choice of expressions, our views being so totally unlike; but I am wholly unconscious of any such coincidence; and it is not the least remarkable part of the "supposition," that I am at the same time accused of this extreme accuracy of memory, and of having entirely forgotten the only point in which I was immediately and personally interested.

Two other questions of nomenclature are introduced by Mr. Ogilby. The first of them has reference to my generic name for the group of

animals of which *Ph. Cookii* forms part, which he rejects because it is believed to be the native name of an animal not comprehended in that group. If all generic names (whether classical or barbarous) in the same predicament were to be rejected, how many new names would it not be necessary to introduce into the science in place of those given by the highest authorities! The other question has reference to my *Halmaturus Tasmanei*; and as Mr. Ogilby admits it is merely one of precedence, I leave it therefore on his own statement to the decision of those whom it may concern; observing only, that "previously" can in no way apply to the 28th of February in reference to the 10th of the same month in the same year, or to the 1st of May in reference to the 1st of April.

I regret to have been placed under the necessity of occupying so much of your valuable space on questions of little more than personal importance. I trust, however, that I have treated them without any exhibition of personal feeling, and it would give me sincere pleasure to find them met in a similar spirit.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN EDWARD GRAY.

British Museum, 10th May, 1838.

XXXIV.—*Prodromus of a Monograph of the Radiata and Echinodermata*. By LOUIS AGASSIZ, D.M.*

[Continued from p. 43.]

I.

THE order *Fistulides* or the *Holothuriæ* contains but one family, which corresponds to the genus *Holothuria* of Linnæus, with the exception of those species which did not rightly belong there. Their body is soft, contractile, more or less elongated, beset with tentacula similar to those of the ambulacra of the *Echini*, and are sometimes arranged as regularly as in the latter. The mouth is situated at the anterior extremity of the body, surrounded by appendices, more or less ramified and fringed; the anus is placed towards the opposite extremity. Notwithstanding the elongated form of these animals, by which they more or less resemble worms, we perceive in the interior and even at the surface the radiated disposition of certain parts of their body, which are arranged in vertical bands, extending from the mouth to the posterior extremity. The numerous species which this division now contains renders it necessary to establish several genera, which

* Translated from the *Annales des Sciences Naturelles* for May 1837.